State of Nevada IT Project Oversight Committee

Agenda & Meeting Minutes

Meeting Name: ITPOC
Facilitator: Kathy Ryan
Recorder: Kathy Ryan
Date: August 5, 2004
Time: 1:30 PM
Location: State Library Board Room

Attendees

Members	Attend ✔	Guests
Roberta Roth, UCCSN	✔	Randel Stevens, DoIT
Kathy Ryan, DoIT	✔	Tom Summers, Taxation
Dave McTeer, IFS		Stan Gillie, Taxation
Robert Chisel, NDOT	✔	
Janet Pirozzi, DETR	✔	
Kathy Comba, DPS	✔	
Chuck Moltz, AG	✔	
Grant Reynolds, B&I	✔	

Minutes –

The minutes from the 7/1/04 meeting were reviewed and approved.

Agenda Items and Discussion

1.	**Presentation of the B&I Real Estate Division Licensing project:** Grant Reynolds, project manager, presented the Real Estate Licensing project to the committee. This project will implement the new Integrated Data System for the Real Estate Division (RED) and will support the division's core business functions. The system is a COTS solution designed for governmental licensing, regulatory and enforcement agencies. This system will replace the current 18 legacy applications with a single integrated system and increase the efficiency of RED's operation and stream line business processes. The project started 7/7/04 and has a target end date of 3/18/05. The committee reviewed the project documentation and project plan. One of the first deliverables from the vendor is a gap analysis and an updated project plan. The committee discussed potential areas of concern and impact to the project with the project manager: ensuring agency staff has the time to work on the project, changing business processes, resources required for review of deliverables and user acceptance testing, building test cases for the users to test, quality assurance, and responsibility for contact with the vendor.

2.	**Discussion of the Closeout of the Tax MBT project:**
	Tom Summers, project manager presented the Project Closeout report for the Tax MBT project. The committee posed the question why the project was ending without completing Phase III.
	Tom advised the committee that the project was originally scheduled for 8/12/03 through 8/10/04. Upon completion of the capability to send out tax returns, process returns and distribute the tax receipts, the team was directed to break the project into phases. Phase I was determined to be complete 3/1/04. At that time, the IT staff proposed simultaneously developing an auto-processor for the Business License Fee (BL) on the MBT platform, to automatically post BL from the bank lockbox to relieve pressure from the processing section. This was projected to not have any impact on the MBT developmental timeline. Phase II of MBT was projected to be complete by 6/30/04, with Phase III projected to be complete by 9/30/04. The user community had proposed several enhancements that were to be accomplished in the third phase. At the MBT status meeting on 7/21/04, every aspect of the remaining deliverables was scrutinized item by item by the MBT committee. It was determined, and agreed to by all, that the original charter, the "85% Solution" had been achieved. With the beginning of development of the Unified Tax System two weeks away, further programming efforts were halted, with any further enhancements to be approved and prioritized by the Applications Change Control Board. It was also felt that the time and effort to complete the BL processor exceeded the efforts to post the returns manually.
	Tom also shared the Lessons Learned from the project:
	• Implement a time-tracking system to better allocate programmer time, as well as contractor expense to the appropriate project ("New taxes" encompassed several endeavors).
	• Define in greater depth overtime/comp time tracking for other Department staff to properly allocate expenses between MBT development, versus MBT administrative efforts such as posting and processing.
	• Given more lead time, a more conventional approach may have been taken, but with the implementation date six months ahead of anything the Department had testified to the Legislature that could be accomplished, the same approach would probably be taken. In retrospect, upon completion of the first major deliverable, a basic plan for the remainder of the project could have been developed with the remaining deliverables more closely defined.
	• Earlier implementation of procedures for migration from the development platform, to testing, to the production environment.
	• Earlier implementation of an Applications Change Control Board to approve and prioritize requested changes and enhancements to all systems.
3.	**Review of the Education SAIN project schedule and status report:**
	No project updates were received. Kathy will follow up with the project manager and the Superintendent of Education and advise the CIO.

4.	**Review of the Child Nutrition Project IPR, Deliverables Payment Schedule and quarterly risk management report**: Randel Stevens, the project manager, gave the committee an update on the project. The Dept of Education was relying on the Federal grant from the Dept of Agriculture to pay for the remaining phases of the project. They did not get the funding. Phase 1 is implemented and running. Phase 2 is in user acceptance testing. The project is now short $237K and they are working with the vendor to determine what they can get done within the actual funding. They may need to delete some of the deliverables. This will result in a contract amendment for the October BOE.
5.	**Review of the DETR Contributions Redesign IPRs** The committee reviewed the monthly reports and did not have any questions or concerns.
6.	**Review of the MHDS AIMS to Avatar replacement project IPR and Deliverables payment schedule:** The committee reviewed the monthly IPR and the deliverables payment schedule and did not have any questions. The first phase of the project was successfully implemented and the team is now working on Phase II.
7.	**Review of the DCFS AIMS to Avatar replacement project IPR and Deliverables payment schedule:** The committee reviewed the monthly IPR and the deliverables payment schedule. The first phase of the project was successfully implemented and the team is now working on Phase II. In reviewing the deliverables payment schedule, the committee noticed that seven deliverables were delivered by the vendor but the vendor had not yet sent an invoice. Six deliverables require a due date revision which will necessitate a contract amendment. The committee agreed to monitor the September report and see if the invoices are paid and the contract amendment done.
8.	**Review of the DoIT Microwave project IPRs:** The committee reviewed the monthly reports and did not have any questions or concerns.
9.	**Review of the DHCFP-DSS IPR & Deliverables Payment Schedule**: The committee reviewed the IPR and the outstanding deliverables report. The IPR was incomplete and the actual costs were removed from the report. Roberta will contact the project manager, Mel Rosenberg, and ask for an explanation of the outstanding deliverables.
10.	**Review of monthly Wildlife Licensing CSPEC, Deliverables Schedule and quarterly risk management report:** The committee reviewed the monthly reports. Roberta had followed up with the project manager, Patty Wagner, concerning the overdue deliverables (6.6.3.7, 6.9.3.3 and 6.9.3.4.)

	Patty advised that the question regarding the Final User Acceptance for Hunter Education is answered in the NWDS Status Report for July 2004 under Risk Management and the explanation for the delay in payment for the Detailed Design Document Part 2 is contained under Problems and Resolutions of the same report. They received the invoice and paid for the Detailed Design Document Part 2. As explained in the Status Report, the document has grown to such immense size that the document has been broken into multiple parts. They will receive additional documents, Part 3 and Part 4, at no additional cost to the agency.
10.	**Discussion items:** PSP 9.02 - IT Project Oversight was reviewed and revised. The committee discussed the issue of departments signing contracts with vendors that are dependent on grant funding that has not yet been authorized. Perhaps contracts should only be written for the phase the department has the actual funding for, with the intention for future phases, but make it explicit to the vendor that future phases are dependent on receiving grant funding. . It was agreed to discuss this with the CIO.
11.	**Review of the Upcoming IT projects:** September – Tax UTS project

Action Items[1]

Item No.	Date Opened	Description	Assigned To	Status	Date Closed
69.	4/1/04	Contact the Wildlife project manager and inquire about Deliverables 6.6.3.7, 6.9.3.3 and 6.9.3.4. Are they overdue? What is the status?	Roberta	Done	8/5/04
75.	4/1/04	Review all ITPOC PSPs and update as needed. Some new forms have been added and one has been deleted. The PSPs need to reflect these changes. Also: Develop a template and guide for contingency plans. Reference guides need to be developed for the IPR, Project Closeout report and the Deliverables Payment Schedule. For the IPR guide it should include instructions to include staff time along with the contract amount for the vendor, and equipment and other costs for a total budget. Revisit the weighting criteria used for the Risk Assessment. Some items automatically should make a project high-risk. Develop an alternate method for calculating variances on the IPR. Change the form to ask the project managers to provide a status for the stated risks and issues on the IPR. If something has been resolved it needs to be noted as such. Add Quality Assurance reports to the reports sent to the ITPOC for review.	All	Ongoing	
82.	7/1/04	Complete the list of questions the ITPOC will ask of project managers making their initial presentation to the committee.	All		
83.	7/1/04	Discuss trend of inadequate human resources assigned to IT projects with the CIO. Set up a meeting.	Roberta/ Kathy		
84.	8/5/04	Contact the DHCFP project manager and request clarification on outstanding deliverables.	Roberta		

---

[1] *Action Item*: A commitment to complete an action or an assignment.

Decisions[2]

Item No.	Decision	Date

Approved By

Signature	Name	Role	Date

---

[2] *Decision*: Reaching a conclusion… particularly in response to a course of action.